

THE
Church OF England

TRULY

Represented,

According to Dr. *Heylins* History of the

Reformation,

In Justification

Of her Royal Highness the Late Dutches of

YORKS Paper.

*Induantur qui detrahunt mihi, pudore : & operiantur sicut
dipluide confusione sua, Psal. 108. v. 28.*

LONDON,

Printed for the Author, and Sold by *Matthew Turner*
near *Turn-stile* in *Holbourn*, 1686.

THE
Church of England
 TRULY
 Represented, &c.

THe *Ignis Fatuus* of Reformation struck by Collision out of the lustful and violent desires of King *Henry* the Eighth, and the opposition made to them by the *Pope*: The Riches of *Abbeys* and *Monasteries*, still administering new matter unto it all the reign of that unhappy Prince; grew to the Prodigy of a Comet in the immature years of his Son King *Edward* the Sixth, by many *Acts of Spoil and Rapine* even to a high degree of Sacrilege on *Chanteries*, *Bishopricks*, *Hospitals* and *Churches*, and wandering as in *Exile* all the time of Queen *Mary*, about *Zurick*, *Basil*, *Geneva*, but chiefly about *Frankfort*; is thus again usher'd into the Land by that great Luminary of his Church Dr. *Heylin* to be refin'd of the filth it had drawn unto it from the Lakes in the *Alpes*, and to be new moulded and formed into a Church by Queen *Elizabeth* to make good here *Legitimation*.

Heylin in
 pref.

pag. 131

She

She (says he) knew full well, that her Legitimation and the Popes Supremacy could not stand together, and that she could not possibly maintain the one without a discarding of the other. And what follows, we more feelingly know than Dr. Heylin, viz. That the Answer of the Pope according to his accustomed vigour : *That the Kingdom of England was held in Fee of the Apostolick See ; that she could not succeed being Illegitimate ; that he could not contradict the Declarations of Clement the Seventh, and Paul the Third ; That it was a great boldness to assume the Name, and Government of it without him,* was not only the foundation of the Church of *England*, but also of all the Distractions and Miseries this poor Land has suffer'd from that day to this. And all this upon a frivolous account of a pretended Donation of this Kingdom to the Pope by King *John* the usurper ; which had been equally frivolous, had he been never so lawfull a King.

But ! what a Bottom is this to build a Church upon ? And to forsake the Communion of a Church professed so many hundreds of years, and established by so many Laws in the Nation ; because forsooth the *Queens Legitimation, and the Pope's Supremacy could not stand together* ? We read, that *the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against the Church of Christ* : But had the Pope, and the Queen, known how to have adjusted their differences, this *Ignis Fatuus* had been extinguish't in the Lake of *Geneva*, and the Church of *England* had never been seen, nor heard of in the world. And will any man in his wits repose his hopes of salvation in a Church, that came from so bare an accident, so meer a chance as this, midwived into the world by a Maiden Queen to make good her Legitimation ?

More-

Moreover, we read, that *Christ will be with his Church to the end of the world.* But (I pray) when did he begin to be with *this Church*? was it when the *Queen* had made good her Legitimation? She has not done it yet. But, (as Dr. *Heylin* well observes) *Bacon* was not to be told of an old Law-maxime; That the *Crown* takes away all defects: Which, it seems, in the language of the Law, was a *Tantamount* to a *Legitimation*; and on this *Tantamount* was first erected the *Crown*, and on that the *Church*; as tho' the Law-makers ever meant, that that odd scrap of Law should be extended to Legitimate, whom the Law had illegitimated; which, if so, might as well have legitimated the Rebellion of *Oliver Cromwel*, (had he clapt the *Crown* on his head,) and made him a lawful King, tho he had been a Bastard into the bargain. And now, I think, here is enough said of the fundamental and final Cause of the Church of *England*, viz. The *Pope's* accustomed Rigour, and the *Queens* legitimation. I will now proceed to consider the Embryo of this Church in the rest of her Causes, according to Dr. *Heylin*, and then I hope I shall have truly Represented her according to her best, and most beloved Historian.

I find no greater Enemies to Reformations, than Reformers; each Reformer, like the Ape in the story, thinking his own *Brat* the fairest, would have no Reformation stand good but his own; and therefore reviles and flouts at the rest as whimsys and phancys; as indeed they are no better, nor his own neither. Who ever saw more bitter scolding, than between the *Lutherans*, the *Zuinglians*, and the *Calvinists*? the worst of men cannot be represented greater Villains, than they represent each other; and, if a man considers them rightly, he will find

no

no other truth but This in all their Volums; and yet some of them are very voluminous too. In like manner does the *Presbyterian* revile and flout at the *Church of England* in his *Cobler of Gloucester*; and serves Her up to his Readers in whole *Cart loads* of debauched Ministers and prophane Bishops: But indeed the *Church of England* reviles and ridicules the *Presbyterian* with much more wit and far greater civility in her *Hudibras*: But, with too much Rigour too: For she will not allow *Sow-Gelders* when they wind their horns to geld a Cat, to cry Reform: Nor an Oyster-wench to shut up shop, and trudge about to cry no Bishop; as tho' *Sow-Gelders* might not as well cry Reform the *Church of England*, as a pack of Laymen in Parliament, cry, Reform the *Church of Rome*; or as tho' an Oyster-Wench might not as well cry No Bishop, as Queen Elizabeth cry No Pope. How can it enter into the head of an Episcopal man, that a Church of so long standing, as the R. Catholick Church had been of continuance in *England*, & backt by so many Old Laws, could on a suddain be lay'd aside, with all her Doctrins, and a new one foisted into her place with new ones, without either Patriark of the West, Primates of the Land, or Bishops at all to it.

This is the case of the *Church England*, and Dr. Heylin makes it out as clear, as ever the sun shin'd at noon day. He tells you, that in the beginning of that Parliament, 1. Eliz. which Parliament made, and establisht the Church, that the Oath of Supremacy was tendered to the Bishops; upon the refusal whereof, they were cast out of PARLIAMENT, all but Bishop *Kitching* who took the Oath, but never was PROTESTANT notwithstanding. Then it is evident, that the old Bishops were not in Parliament at the

the devising and making of this Church. He begins the 2d. year of Queen *Elizabeth* with the consecrating of the new Bishops, *Parker* and the rest; then they were not in Parliament neither at the devising and making of this Church: for the Church was made and established in the first year of Q.*Elizabeth*, & the Church to this day dates from this first of *Elizabeth*, as *Rome* did formerly *ab urbe condita*: And therefore my Lord Chancellor *Finch* in an eloquent speech to the Parliament, learnedly declared unto them, that she was a Church now of above a hundred years standing, meaning from this first of *Elizabeth*: Then you see that Dr. *Heylin* has made it as clear as the sun, that there were no Bishops at all at the making of this Church.

Men of the *Gospel*, now tell me, Are not Bishops of the Essence of God's Church? no Episcopal man ever deny'd it. And men of the Law, tell me, Are not Bishops so of the Essence of this Government, that there can be no Parliament without them? no Lawyer can deny it. Then here is a Church set up in spite of God, and in defiance to the fundamental Laws of the Land. And this forsooth is your *Church by Law established*! Established! with a *non obstante* to the very Essence of the Government by Bishops, which God set over his Church; and to the Essence and foundation of this Government of this Realm: So that, unless the deserting of one Church for *lust*, *spoil*, *rapin*, and *sacrilege* be the setting up, making and establishing of another; there has been neither Church made, nor settled, nor established since the defection from the Church of *Rome* in *England* to this present time.

B

Then

Then is it not severe, that after all this ado and noise of a *Church, Articles, Tests, Laws* penal and sanguinary to compel men from their consciences, there should not be the least semblance or shadow of a Church to invite them unto: Nor had the *Queen* with her Lay-Parliament any more Power or Authority by the laws of God, and his Church founded on Episcopacy, to make, alter, or establish a *Church*, than has the Parliament of *Women*, and the poor man that crys it up and down the Town, Power, or Authority to make a *Religion*, and establish it when he had done, by crying it about the streets: Nor do I see how it is possible for any Episcopal man to have confidence to pretend the contrary.

With good Reason then did the late Dutches of *Tork* of happy memory declare, that instead of satisfaction in the *History of the Reformation* recommended to her for that purpose, she found nothing, but the description of the horriest sacrileges in the world; and could find no Reason why we left the Church, but for three the most abominable ones, that were ever heard of amongst Christians. First, *Henry 8th* renounces the Popes Authority, because he would not give him leave to part with his wife, and marry an other in her life time. Secondly, *Edward 6th* was a Child, and governed by his Uncle, who made his estate out of Church-Lands, and then *Queen E.* who being no lawful Heiress to the Crown, could have no way to keep it, but by renouncing a Church, that could never suffer so unlawful a thing to be done by one of her Children. I confess, I cannot think the Holy Ghost could be in such Counsels.

The

The Church being thus truly represented, and showed to be nothing; it must necessarily follow, that her Bishops and Priests are likewise nothing, as to any *Power* or *Mission*, they can pretend to: And *how shall they Preach, unless they be sent?* For in a Bishop, is required not only Ordination, but also Spiritual Jurisdiction and *Mission*, and both these are derived not from Kings, or Queens, but immediately from *Christ* by succession from the *Apostles*: Then the Church of *England* being nothing, and in Communion with no other Episcopal Church; by what succession will her Bishops derive their *Powers* from the *Apostles*? Do they think the Church of *Rome* sent them to Preach the Doctrine of the Thirty Nine Articles? No, it cannot be so imagin'd; and therefore the Presbyterians derive their *Mission* extraordinarily from God by the *Spirit*: well knowing, that it were impossible for them to derive it Ordinarily, by succession through the Church of *Rome* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*. So that 'tis a clear Case that the pretended Bishops of *England* have no *Mission* nor Power at all, to do what they do, but from lay Authority.

But, indeed, as to the *Ordination*, it is quite another thing: for the *Arian* and *Donatist* Bishops were true Bishops as to *Ordination*, tho by Apostacy and Heresie they had lost their *Mission*. And Dr. *Heylin* pretends the like of the Bishops of the Church of *England*: and to clear all doubts to the contrary, tells us, that the story of the first four Bishops of his Church being merrily ordained at the *Naggs-head Tavern* in *Cheapside*, was but the invention chiefly of one *Neal*, once Hebrew reader in *Oxford*, and Chaplain to Bishop *Bon-*

pag. 294

ner, and Dr. *Sanders*; and thus like an erudite Protestant, learnedly and compendiously confutes them both: *Sanders* he calls *Slanders*; and as for the other, it is enough that he was once Chaplain to *Bonner*, and so their business is soon done.

He also tells us, that *George Abbot*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, caused several Priests and Jesuits, then Prisoners in the Clink to be brought before him: *Who being brought to Lambeth the Twelfth of May, 1613. were suffered in the presence of diverse Bishops to peruse the publick Registers, and thereby to satisfy themselves in all particulars concerning the Confirmation and Consecration of Archbishop Parker.* Dr. *Heylin* is indeed a very punctual man; you see he sets down exactly the day of the Month, and the year this happened, viz. The Twelfth of May, 1613. But Bishop *Parker* was consecrated in the second year of *Queen Elizabeth*, 1559. Then where were these Registers all this while? Dr. *Sanders*, Dr. *Harding*, Dr. *Stapleton*, even in the time of Archbishop *Parker*, and to himself called his Consecration in question, and denied it, without any Reply either from himself or any body else in his behalf. Then where were at that time these same Registers?

But suppose these Registers true, and that the Consecration was at *Lambeth*, and the Consecration-dinner only at the *Naggs-head*, did not multitudes of people flock to see the great solemnity of Consecrating the first four new Bishops of the Novel Church? and was not the Dinner well attended on by multitudes both of men and women (for they are also curious, especially in Church

Church affairs) and were all these men and women dead on a suddain, that none should be left alive to witness against *Neal* and *Sanders*, that they saw *Parker* Consecrated at *Lambeth*? Or could so great a man as *Dr. Sanders* have the confidence to broach such a *Tale* (as *Dr. Heylin* calls it) when multitudes of eye-witnesses were alive to give him the *lye*? Had those Registers been found out in any competent time, and flapt in the faces of *Neal* and *Sanders*, and the rest who reproached the Church with her *Naggs-head* Consecration, they might all have been justly called *Slanderers*; but instead of finding such Registers, the Church and State politickly combined to renew the statutes against *Tellers of false news*, that a poor Papist if he passed through *Cheapside*, durst not so much as look toward that side of the street, where the *Naggs-head* stood, for fear of being punished as a *Teller of false news*: for the looks of a Papist in those days boaded false news; as a Wall-ball in his pocket of late boded ~~the~~ firing of the City.

And indeed, to produce these Registers Fifty four years after the time, and not before, when *Neal* and *Sanders*, the Vintner of the *Naggs-head*, his wife, drawers, and all were dead; was to as much purpose, as if they had left them at *Salamanca* in *Dr. Oates* his Library to be brought over with the Forty Thousand pilgrims, 1678. *September*, the Lord knows when; for *Oates* did not confine himself to a day as *Dr. Heylin*, and *Mason* the forger of the Registers did. But *Dr. Heylin* treats of this matter here *en passant* only, and refers his Readers for their further satisfaction to the

the beginning of his eight and last book, where thus he tells his own Tale worth any mans reading.

Nothing remaineth, but that we settle the Episcopal Government; and then it will be time to conclude this History. And for the settling of this Government by as good Authority, as could be given unto it by the Laws of the Land, we are beholding to the obstinacy of Dr. Edmund Bonner, late slaughter-man of London. By a statute made in the last Parliament for keeping her Majesties Subjects in due obedience, a Power was given unto the Bishops to tender, and receive the Oath of Supremacy ~~to~~ ^{from} all manner of persons dwelling and residing in their several Dioceses. Bonner was then prisoner in the Clink or Marshalsee; which being in the Borrough of Southwark, brought him within the Jurisdiction of Horn Bishop of Winchester, by whose Chancellour the Oath was tendered unto him: on the refusal of which Oath, he is indicted at the Kings Bench upon the Statute: to which he appeared in some Term of the year foregoing, &c. The second Principal Plea was this, that Horn at the time the Oath was tendered, was not Bishop of Winchester, and therefore not impowred by the said Statute to make tender of it by himself, or by his Chancellour. And for the proof of this, that he
was

was no Bishop, it was alledged, that the form of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, which had been ratify'd by Parliament in the time of King Edward, had been repealed in the first year of Queen Mary, and so remained at Horn's pretended Consecration. The Cause being put off from Term to Term, comes at last to be debated amongst the Judges at Serjeants Inn, by whom it was finally put upon the Issue, and the Tryal of that Issue ordered to be committed to a Jury of the County of Surry: But then withall, it was advised, that the decision of the point, should rather be referred to the following Parliament, for fear that such a weighty matter might miscarry by a Country Jury, of whose either Partiality, or Insufficiency, there had been some proof made before touching the Grants made by King Edwards Bishops, of which a great many were made void, under pretence that the Grantors were not Actually Bishops, nor Legally possessed of their several Sees.

According to this sound advice, the business comes under consideration in the following Parliament, which begun on the Thirtyeth of September, where all particulars being fully, and consideratly discoursed upon, it was first declared, that their not restoring that book to the former Power in Terms significant, and express,

was

was but casus omisus; And secondly, that by the Statutes Fifth and Sixth of Edward the Sixth, it had been added to the book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, as a Member of it, or at least an Appendant to it; and therefore by the first of Elizabeth was restored again, together with the said book of Common Prayer, intentionally at the least, if not in Terminis. But being that the words of the said Statute were not clear enough to remove all doubts, they did therefore revive it now, and did accordingly Enact, That all persons that had been, or should be made, ordered, or Consecrated Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of God's Holy Words, and Sacraments, or Deacons after the form and order prescribed in the said book, be in every deed, and also by Authority hereof declared and enacted to be, and shall be Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of God's holy Words and Sacraments, and Deacons rightly made, Consecrated and ordered, any Statute, Law, Canon, or any thing to the contrary notwithstanding.

A bold Parliament indeed, that thus generously bids defiance to all Laws and Statutes ever made in the world, to all Canons ever made in God's Church, and to every thing else whatsoever. To good purpose then did Saint Gregory the Great, and Bishop Lawd after him, declare that they gave the like credit to the first

first four General Councils, as to the four Evangelists; when an English Parliament shall come and enact and declare Bishops in the form they please with a *non obstante* to all the Powers of Heaven and Earth, or any thing to the contrary notwithstanding, i. e. of Hell too.

But being that Dr. Heylin tells us, that this business, was onely *fully and considerately discoursed upon in Parliament*; it may I hope yet bear a further discussion and canvassing. You see, here were many doubts whether these Bishops were rightly consecrated or not.

First, Because the Form of Consecration made in King Edwards days, was declared void and null in the first year of Queen Mary; and as yet has never been allowed in the Church of Rome.

Secondly, Because you see, there was a *Casus omisus*, and the Form of King Edward was not restored in *Terms expresse* and *significant*, which is requisite in Law.

Thirdly, To talk of a Statute once made null and void, *intentionally* is non-sence: For Intention will not make Law; neither is it in Church affairs, nor indeed, is it any where else, as it is in *England*, where there are definitive Interpreters of Law, and no Law Text, and where there is Gospel and no definitive Interpreters of the Text.

Fourthly, Because, *the words in the said Statute were not clear enough to remove doubts*: Then 'tis clear that there were doubts.

Fifthly, Because the Doubts were so many, that the whole Power of the Kingdom, Queen, Council, Church and State, durst not venture a tryal against a

poor Prisoner, (notwithstanding that the business was order'd for a tryal by Serjeants Inn) to see it fairly decided, whether the Doubts could be removed or not, *for fear such a weighty matter might miscarry by a County Jury*, as tho' it had not been in their Power to make what Jury they pleased.

Sixthly, *Bonner* tho' a Prisoner, enjoyed his Revenue all this while by dint of Law, that is, from the first of *Eliz.* to the eighth of *Eliz.* because *Horn* in all this time could not prove himself a Bishop: Then the Law did not look upon them as yet Bishops. But, all the Bishops were made in this time, and all that pretend to be now Bishops are derived from them; Then how sacrilegious were those Bishops that administered the Sacraments and conferred Orders, whilst so many Doubts remained. Whether they were truly ordained, or had any lawful Jurisdiction or not. And of this there can be no question, nor can any man deny it.

But now comes the Parliament, the Doubts are removed and *Horn* gets his Cause; But how? were both Parties heard? No; nor durst the Parliament hear what *Bonner* could say for himself, nor what his Lawyers could say for him neither, who were Eminent Men, as *Dr. Heylin* tells us, *Wrey*, *Lovelace* and *Plyden*; nor is it to be imagined that such Eminent Men would have undertaken so invidious a business to Church and State, unless they had foreseen, that the Cause was sure enough in their hands. It is a received Maxim throughout the world, that *Qui judicat causa inaudita altera iniquus est Judex*; He that judges without hearing both Parties is a wicked Judge. But this Parliament judged without hearing both parties:

ties : then this was *iniquum Parliamentum, iniquus Judex*; a wicked Parliament, wicked Judges : then what are the Bishops, who are no otherwise Bishops, than by verdict of such Iniquity ? But this is not all.

Either those Bishops of whose Consecration there were so many Doubts were in this Parliament or not ? Of right they could not be there until the Doubts were removed : But either they were, or they were not ? If they were, can any thing be more pleasantly ridiculous, than to see the very men in question whether Bishops or not, sit judging in Parliament, and voting themselves *to be in very deed, and also by Authority hereof* (that is, of themselves) *declared and enacted to be, and shall be Arch-Bishops, Bishops, &c. rightly made, consecrated, and ordered; any thing to the contrary notwithstanding.* This is far worse, than ask my Brother if I am a Thief. In fine, it is so ridiculous, that for soberness sake, we will suppose, that those pretended Bishops did not sit in that Parliament. Then was the Parliament but a pack of Laymen; and what have such to do with enacting or declaring of Bishops ? Bishops derive their ordination and the power that follows it, immediately from Christ himself by succession from the Apostles, (as I said before) and not from *King* nor *Queen*; It is a thing purely spiritual, and therefore cannot fall under the cognizance of any Temporal Power : So that the pretended Bishops were no more Bishops for this Act of Parliament, than they were before : For such a Parliament neither had power to enact them Bishops, nor to declare them such : so that all the former Doubts yet remain, and reach our present pretended Bishops equally, and as much, as they did

the former. But it is *Sacriledge* for any pretended Bishop to offer to administer the Sacraments, and confer Orders, when but one Doubt remains, whether he be rightly in Orders himself, or have Authority to do it; Then greater is the *Sacriledge*, when men offer to administer the Sacraments and confer Orders, when so many Doubts remain whether they be in Orders, or rightly authorized to do such Acts.

And now to conclude, how came Dr. *Heylin* so well acquainted with Bishop *Bonner*, that he should know which were his chief Pleas, or what he would chiefly have insisted upon, had the *weighty matter* been suffered to have come to a hearing? Did he think the story of the *Naggs-head* less known to *Bonner*, than it was to *Neal* and *Saunders*? or can any man in his wits believe that the whole Power of the Realm, Queen, Church, Parliament, Council and all, were in earnest afraid the *weighty matter might miscarry by a County Jury*, either by *Partiality* or *Insufficiency*? Was it impossible for the *Queen* and *Church* to have found in the whole County of *Surry*, twelve men according to their own hearts? And could not they have instructed them as far as they pleased, that there could not be any fear of *Insufficiency*? And could not they have made them wholly their own, that there could be no fear of *Partiality*, at leastwise towards *Bonner*? And if all other means had failed, could not they have brib'd and suborn'd them? A more necessary Policy then, when the *weighty matter* was at stake, than ever there was occasion for the like since. And does Dr. *Heylin* call the declining of this Tryal *sound Advice*;
Certainly,

Certainly, when this question was started, *Bishops or not Bishops* ? And that the Cause, debated amongst the Judges at Serjeants Inn, was finally put upon the Issue, and the Tryal of that Issue ordered to be committed to a Jury of the County of Surry, it was necessary the world should be satisfied. But the *Queen* and *Church* did foresee, either that such things would be brought upon the stage, as would be very dishonourable to both, or that the pretended Bishop *Horn* would be cast. And then whither would her Majesty have sent for Bishops to Consecrate her new *Elects* ? The Catholick Bishops would not do it, and of that she had a Tryal in *Kitchin*. The *Lutherans* would not do it; for Dr. *Heylin* tells us, that they would not receive English fugitives in *Queen Mary's* time, and that they called such as dyed here then, the *Devils Martyrs*. So that the Church of *England* must e'en have been an Episcopal Church without Bishops. And that had not been more ridiculous, than it was infamous, and Scandalous to have declined the Tryal.

That my Reader may the better remember, what has been said ; I thus in short Recapitulate it. The first beginning of Reformation was founded on *lust*, it encreased by *Spoil, Rapine* and *Sacriledge* ; it was at last new moulded, and formed into a Church to Legitimate the *Queen*, when nothing else could do it ; it was made and establishd a Church by a Power, that had no more Authority to make, and establish Churches, than has the poor man with his Parliament of women, which he crys about the streets, Authority to make and establish Religions. The pretended

ded Bishops of this pretended Church are no Bishops at all; or at the best, they can but pretend to be Bishops with many doubts on their backs, whether they are Bishops or not; and consequently must lye under the guilt of Sacrilege for Administring the Sacraments, and conferring Orders, those doubts still remaining unclear'd, nor possible now ever to be so. For no ensuing Parliament can ever do it: nor if it could, were it ever possible for them to prove by what Lawfully Authorized Successor's of the Apostles, they werẽ sent to Preach the Doctrine of the Thirty Nine Articles.

Thus is the pretended Church of *England* truly represented throughout all her causes, except her Material ones; and those I omitted, because she has none: being only made up, but of No's and Negatives, of which hereafter. In the mean time I defy any man to shew me, that I have Slandered her with the least untruth in the world. Had not then the good late Dutcheſs of York just Reason to *confess*, that *ſhe* could not think the Holy Ghost could ever be in such Counſels?

FINIS.

